TELLS THE FACTS AND NAMES THE NAMES

CounterPunch

AUGUST 2007 ALEXANDER COCKBURN AND JEFFREY ST. CLAIR VOL. 14, NO. 14

The Vices of Hillary Clinton

Secrecy, Intransigence and War

By Alexander Cockburn and Jeffrey St. Clair

Hillary Clinton's propensity for overkill earned her and Bill the enmity of people capable of inflicting serious damage, as the Whitewater and Cattle Futures scandals duly attested. And soon, as they embarked on the 1992 presidential campaign, the same overkill reflex produced a perfect storm of bad publicity that came within an ace of finishing Clinton off altogether.

In January 2002, America was introduced to the Gennifer Flowers scandal, courtesy of the *National Enquirer*. Flowers was a former Little Rock newscaster with whom Governor Clinton had an extended love affair for five years in the 1980s, as pleasingly chronicled in Flowers' entirely credible memoir, *Gennifer Flowers: Passion and Betrayal*.

After the *Enquirer* broke the Flowers story while Clinton was campaigning in New Hampshire, his campaign advisors went into crisis mode, trying to figure out the best defense. Seasoned tacticians like Betsey Wright and David Ifshin suggested that the best course would be to shrug the story off as unsubstantiated gossip mongering by a supermarket tabloid. The national press corps was already taking this tack, since the reporters on the campaign bus were loath to admit they had been scooped by the *Enquirer* — whose story was in fact a piece of well-researched investigative reporting, backed up by taped phone calls and messages to Gennifer from Bill.

(EDITORS CONTINUED ON PAGE 2)

Scenes from the Struggle for the Rights of The Guantanamo Detainees

By Andy Worthington

As the time steadily approaches when the U.S. Supreme Court will consider whether, after over three years of stalling and obfuscation on the part of the administration, the detainees at Guantanamo will be allowed "full access to the U.S. court system" and the right to challenge the basis of their detention in federal courts, the Associated Press reports that 411 senior officials from the United States and Europe — 25 retired U.S. diplomats, two retired rear admirals, a retired Marine general, and 383 current or former members of the European and British parliaments — made their support for the detainees' case clear to the Supreme Court on Friday , August 24.

Their opposition to the administration's policies stems from a profound dissatisfaction with the tribunal system — the Combatant Review Status Tribunals (CRST) — which were hurriedly established by the administration after the Supreme Court first ruled, 38 months ago, that the detainees had the right to challenge their detention — after they had already spent two and a half years in a hermetically sealed legal limbo. Far from being an adequate response, the tribunals — in which three-member military panels reviewed the detainees' status as enemy combatants, but the detainees themselves had no right to legal counsel and were not allowed to see the classified information on which most of the verdicts were supposedly based — had been criticized from the moment of their inception. They were recently subjected to fierce condemnation by Lt. Col. Stephen Abraham, a member of the team responsible for compiling the "evidence" used in the tribunals. Abraham criticized the entire process as severely flawed, often relying on "generic" evidence and designed solely to rubber-stamp the detainees' prior designation as "enemy combatants". Abraham's statement, filed in a case in June, is widely credited with encouraging the Supreme Court to agree to take the detainees' case in June, reversing a decision made just two months earlier. Such a reversal is very rare. The last one occurred 60 years ago,

In their submission to the Supreme Court, the 383 European politicians — "of divergent political views", as the AP put it — declared that it was "important that even when faced with the threat of international terrorism, all states, including the United States, comply with the standards set by international humanitarian law and human rights law by granting full court access", and added, pointedly, "The treatment of petitioners currently falls short of these standards".

For their part, the 25 retired U.S. diplomats pointed out that lower court rulings "supporting the Bush administration's opposition to full court access" were "seized upon by repressive governments as a license to incarcerate their own citizens and others with impunity", but the most trenchant criticism came from Brig. Gen. David M. Brahms, the senior legal adviser for the Marine Corps from 1985-88, Rear Adm. John D. Hutson, the Navy's judge advocate general from 1997-2000, and Rear Adm. Donald J. Guter, the Navy's judge advocate general from 2000-02, who declared that the Tribunals had been "tainted by the

(WORTHINGTON CONTINUED ON PAGE 4)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Befitting a Midwestern Methodist with a bullying father, repression has always been one of Mrs. Clinton's most prominent characteristics.

It was Hillary who instructed the campaign to put the ruthless private investigator Jack Palladino on the case. In her memo to Palladino, she ordered him to "impeach Flowers' character and veracity until she is destroyed beyond all recognition." Thus primed, Palladino went into action, seeking to portray Flowers as a prostitute, a shakedown artist and career scamster.

While Palladino was trying to finish off Flowers, Hillary urged Bill to follow the high-risk strategy of both of them going on CBS's *60 Minutes* for an interview conducted by Steve Kroft. In front of a vast national audience Bill, visibly ill at ease, admitted to causing pain to his family while denying that their marriage was merely an arrangement. "This is a marriage," he asserted. Hillary broke in. Years of effort in burnishing Bill's image as a Son of the South went up in smoke as she declared, "You know, I'm not sitting here like some little woman standing by my man like Tammy Wynette."

The polls promptly showed Bill's numbers plummeting south of the Mason-Dixon line. An affair with Flowers was one thing, but insulting Tammy Wynette? The nation's number one country star had been watching the program and was furious. She immediately called her publicist to vent her outrage, and the publicist relayed this to the press. For three days the Clinton campaign tried to talk to Wynette. She declined all calls until finally they got Burt Reynolds to call her, and she relented, releasing the news she would accept Hillary's apologies.

The next storm the Clintons had to face was the matter of his avoidance of the draft during the Vietnam War. James Carville, the campaign manager, advocated forthright admission that this is what he had done. Clinton agreed with Carville's plan to go on ABC's *Nightline* with Ted Koppel, bringing with him his famous letter to Colonel Eugene Holmes frankly discussing the conflict between his desire to go and fight in Vietnam and his concomitant eagerness to "maintain my political viability". But Hillary was adamant. He should not admit that he wanted to avoid the draft. On the other hand, he should not be forced to apologize for being against the war. The entire file of documents and letters should be concealed. Her view prevailed, and the inevitable consequence was the draft-dodging issue stayed alive as a steady stream of compromising documents was leaked to the press over the next five months.

The desire for secrecy is one of Mrs. Clinton's enduring and damaging traits, which is why these campaign imbroglios are of consequence. Clinton dug himself into many a pit, but his greatest skill was in talking his way out of them in a manner Americans found forgivable. Befitting a Midwestern Methodist with a bullying father, repression has always been one of Mrs. Clinton's most prominent characteristics. Hers has been the instinct to conceal, to deny, to refuse to admit any mistake. Mickey Kantor, the Los Angeles lawyer who worked on the 1992 campaign, said that Hillary adamantly refused to admit to any mistakes.

It's clear from Jeff Gerth and Don Van Natta Jr.'s very revealing *Her Way: The Hopes and Ambitions of Hillary Rodham Clinton* that Mrs. Clinton played a major role in driving White House lawyer Vince Foster to suicide. After the Clintons arrived in the White House, it became Foster's role to guard their secrets. It was one thing to lock documents into a secret room during the campaign. It was quite another to play hide-and-seek with files in the White House, as Mrs. Clinton required Foster to do. Now there weren't nosy reporters but special prosecutors with subpoenas, looking for documents relevant to Whitewater, to Mrs. Clinton's billing records at Rose Law, her tax records relevant to the commodity trades. Foster was tasked with hiding all these documents: some in his house, some in his office and some — the most damaging files — back in his Little Rock house.

There were additional burdens for Foster. He was trying to douse another fire started by Mrs. Clinton. This was her instruction to fire the White House travel staff, on a trumped-up rationale. There were six separate investigations into these firings, all of which Foster had to deal with. Finally, the wretched man had to listen to Mrs. Clinton publicly blame the whole "Travelgate" mess on him, even as he was concealing documents making it clear she had been the person initiating the mess. On top of that, Mrs. Clinton demanded Foster be the principal liaison with Congress on her health reform plan. For the last month of his life, she refused to communicate with him, even though their offices were thirty feet apart.

Health reform was Mrs. Clinton's assignment in her husband's first term. The debacle is well known. In early 1993, 64 per cent of all Americans favored a system of national health care. By the time Mrs. Clinton's 1342-page bill, generated in secret, landed in Congress, she had managed to offend the very Democratic leadership essential to making health reform a reality. The proposal itself, under the mystic mantra "Managed Competition", embodied all the distinctive tropisms of neoliberalism: a naïve complicity with the darker corporate forces, accompanied by adamant refusal to even consider building the popular political coalition that alone could have faced and routed the insurance and pharmaceutical lobbies — two of the most powerful forces on the American political scene. Mrs. Clinton's rout on health reform remains one of the

CounterPunch

EDITORS
Alexander Cockburn
Jeffrey St. Clair

ASSISTANT EDITOR
Alevtina Rea

BUSINESS
Becky Grant
Deva Wheeler

DESIGN
Tiffany Wardle

COUNSELOR
Ben Sonnenberg

CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558
1-800-840-3683
counterpunch@counterpunch.org
www.counterpunch.org
All rights reserved.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great avoidable disasters of the last century in American politics, and one with appalling human and social consequences.

This disaster was compounded by the fact that after the collapse of health reform, on the advice of Dickie Morris (summoned by Mrs. Clinton), the Clintons swerved right, toward all the ensuing ghastly legislative ventures of their regime — the onslaughts on welfare, the crime bill, NAFTA. With Morris came the birth of "triangulation" — the tactic of the Clinton White House working with Republicans and conservative Democrats and actively undermining liberal and progressive initiatives in Congress. Money that could have given the House back to the Democrats in 1996 was snatched by the White House purely for the self-preservation of the Clintons.

Mrs. Clinton's rout on health reform remains one of the great avoidable disasters of the last century in American politics, and one with appalling human and social consequences.

After health care went down the tubes, Hillary adopted a very low-key political profile, in part because Leon Panetta, the new White House chief of staff, banned her from political meetings. She outflanked him in two ways: by secret strategizing with Morris every two weeks and by nightly strategy sessions with Clinton and Al Gore. She swung back into a crucial public role with the Lewinsky affair, ironically enough, standing by her man. Gerth and Van Natta establish that she knew the full extent of her husband's relations with the woman she called "Elvira" (the mid-'90s horror queen) on January 21, 1998, eight months before the official narrative claims that Bill informed her of his treachery the night before he gave his deposition. She ordered a full-bore attack on Lewinsky as "a stalker with a weight problem" and shoved Bill toward the doomed posture of total denial. He himself had initially been trending toward a stuttering half-admission that hanky-panky might have taken place. But after he returned from the Lehrer show where he had taken this non-combative route, Hillary lashed him into the categorical denial — "I did not have sexual relations with that woman, Ms. Lewinsky" — that exploded so disastrously in the months and years ahead. (Only months earlier, Hillary had been the one who insisted that no deal be made with Paula Jones, who could have been bought off with the modest settlement her lawyer was requesting. Hillary said she didn't want Jones to get "a single dollar".)

Bill had his Tammy, and he knew the price. "Whatever Hil wants, Hil gets," he told his staff in 1998, and he began to read books about the campaigns of successful female politicians — Margaret Thatcher, Indira Gandhi, Benazir Bhutto, Golda Meir. As Clinton headed toward impeachment, Hillary set her course for the New York Senate seat.

Since Vietnam, there's never been a war that Mrs. Clinton didn't like. She argued passionately in the White House for the NATO bombing of Belgrade. Five days after September 11, 2001, she was calling for a broad war on terror. Any country presumed to be lending "aid and comfort" to al-Qaeda "will now face the wrath of our country." Bush echoed these words eight days later in his nationally televised speech on September 21. "I'll stand behind Bush for a long time to come", Senator Clinton promised, and she was as good as her word, voting for the Patriot Act and the wide-ranging authorization to use military force against Afghanistan.

Of course she supported without reservation the attack on Afghanistan and, as the propaganda buildup toward the onslaught on Iraq got underway, she didn't even bother to walk down the hall to read the national intelligence estimate on Iraq before the war. (She wasn't alone in that. Only six senators read that NIE.) When she was questioned about this, she claimed she was briefed on its contents, but in fact no one on her staff had the security clearance to read the report. And her ignorance showed when it came time to deliver her speech in support of the war, as she reiterated some of the most outlandish claims made by Dick Cheney. In this speech, she said Saddam Hussein had rebuilt his chemical and biological weapons program; that he had improved his long-range missile capability; that he was reconstituting his nuclear weapons program; and that he was giving aid and comfort to Al Qaeda. The only other Democratic senator to make all four of these claims in his floor speech was Joe Lieberman. But even he didn't go as far as Senator Hillary. In Lieberman's speech, there was conditionality about some of the claims. In Senator Clinton's, there was no such conditionality, even though a vehement war hawk, Ken Pollack, advising Senator Clinton prior to her vote, had told her that the allegation about the al-Qaeda connection was "bullshit".

Later, as the winds of opinion changed, Senator Clinton claimed — and continues to do so to this day — that hers was a vote not for war but for negotiation. In fact, the record shows that only hours after the war authorization vote she voted against the Democratic resolution that would have required Bush to seek a diplomatic solution before launching the war.

Today, Hillary Clinton says she supports the "surge" in Iraq and claims it's working. This is the candidate who has a 22 per cent lead over Barrack Obama among those who claim to be anti-war Democrats. From candidate, maybe president Hillary Clinton, Iran can expect no mercy. CP

Subscription Information

Subscription information can be found at www.counterpunch.org or call toll-free inside the U.S. 1-800-840-3683

Published twice monthly except July and August, 22 issues a year.

One year hardcopy edition $45
Two year hardcopy edition $80
One year email edition $35
Two year email edition $60
One year email & hardcopy edition $50
One year institutions/supporters $100
One year student/low income, $35

Renew by telephone, mail or on our website. For mailed orders please include name, address and email address (if applicable) with payment. To renew by phone 1-800-840-3683 or 1-707-629 3683. Add $17.50 per year for subscriptions mailed outside the U.S.A.

Make checks or money orders payable to:
CounterPunch
Business Office
PO Box 228, Petrolia, CA 95558

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(WORTHINGTON CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1)
permissible use of evidence obtained by torture" and stated, "If the United States holds prisoners indefinitely — potentially lifetime imprisonment — based on sham Tribunal proceedings and without providing meaningful judicial review of their imprisonment, enemies in current or future conflicts may use that as an excuse to mete out similar treatment to captured American military forces".

The complaints of these 411 men and women are not without precedent. In the last few years, a roll-call of retired U.S. military commanders and diplomats (many of them Republicans) and European parliamentarians have joined a chorus of disapproval from the leaders of other countries, from U.N. representatives, from religious leaders, and from judges, lawyers and human rights activists, pointing out essentially the same things: that the system is monstrously unjust, that it darkens the name of the United States worldwide, that it empowers dictators by example, and that it endangers the lives of U.S. soldiers and civilians abroad. This time, however, the timing may be significant, as the administration is due to begin court filings in its own defense in October.

In other developments in late August, the administration attempted to revive its beleaguered and much reviled system of Military Commissions at Guantanamo, established to try those regarded as the most dangerous detainees in Guantanamo in a brand-new system that spurns both military law and civilian law as enacted on the mainland. Just as the Tribunals have been condemned for providing a pale and unjust imitation of habeas rights, the four-year history of the Commissions has been rocked by judicial setbacks and abortive, farcical proceedings, fostering the widespread belief that the Commissions are as unjust and unprincipled as the Tribunals, and designed, like them, to secure a guilty verdict at all costs and to prevent all mention of torture by U.S. forces.

First condemned by the Supreme Court in June 2006, which ruled that they were illegal under U.S. law and the Geneva Conventions, the Commissions were revived late last year when the Senate passed the criminally negligent Military Commissions Act (MCA) , but they came unstuck as soon as they were reinstated, two months ago. The government-appointed military judges in two cases — that of child soldier Omar Khadr and the Yemeni Salim Hamdan, who worked as a driver for Osama bin Laden — closed down the proceedings because the MCA had authorized them to try "illegal enemy combatants", whereas the Tribunal process, which made detainees eligible for trial by Military Commission, had ruled only that they were "enemy combatants", the word "illegal" being omitted.

Despite efforts to dismiss the distinction as a mere technicality, the judges — Army Colonel Peter Brownback (for Khadr) and Navy Captain Keith Allred (for Hamdan) — refused to back down. The administration, in a fit of pique, declared that it would appeal the decisions. Its plan disclosed the stunning ineptitude of its renegade approach to the law when it emerged that the appeal court in which the government would file its petulant complaints had not yet been established.

This oversight has now been remedied.

"It's like the Titanic. You know someday the ship is going to sink. God almighty, let's get there already!"

As the special appeals court convened on Friday, August 24, in what the *New York Times* described as "a borrowed courtroom half a block from the White House", retired Army Col. Francis Gilligan, one of the military prosecutors, declared, "We're attempting to start the trials", although he added, a little sheepishly, "We've sort of had a judicial stall". This, of course, was something of an understatement, and it remains to be seen whether the newly established and grandly titled "United States Court of Military Commission Review" can overturn the objections expressed by the military judges in June.

The session convened to deal, in the first instance, with Omar Khadr's case, did not get off to a good start. As soon as it began, defense lawyers challenged the very legitimacy of the court, arguing that it was improperly constituted because its members were appointed not by the defense secretary, as the law calls for, but by a deputy secretary. Ignoring this inconvenient truth, Gilligan said that the court should be able to accept that Khadr's tribunal effectively declared him an unlawful combatant, "in part because al-Qaeda does not follow the rules of war". He added that, even if the judges rejected that argument, the prosecution "should be permitted to present proof to a trial judge that Mr. Khadr was in fact an unlawful combatant and could therefore be prosecuted before a military commission". Two of the three judges — Brownback and Allred — did not appear to be convinced.

The administration also faces stiff opposition from the military defense lawyers who, as in the case of Lt. Cmdr. Charles Swift (who represented Hamdan until he was turned down for promotion and forced to leave the military last month) are prepared to sacrifice their careers to maintain opposition to what they regard as a system designed to justify torture and to break the law. Swift, it transpires, was not so easily dismissed, and he will continue to lead Hamdan's team as a civilian lawyer from his new post at Emory University School of Law in Atlanta, and his successor, Army Major Thomas Rougheen, has already expressed his opposition to the system, explaining that he is "confident" that it will "collapse under high court scrutiny", and adding, "It's like the Titanic. You know someday the ship is going to sink. God almighty, let's get there already!"

One of their number, Lt. Cmdr. William C. Kuebler recently described the Commissions as rigged, ridiculous, unjust, farcical, and a sham, adding, "I think things have been done to people that under any definition except this administration's very narrow one would be torture". Now he has indicated that he remains implacably opposed to any attempt to revive the Commissions, telling journalists after the hearing, "This is about the credibility of the United States and the perception around the world of our commitment to the rule of law". Like a gauntlet-hurling hero of old, Kuebler concluded, "This is a lawless process", and "I look forward to further legal fireworks as the limping administration attempts — unsuccessfully, I hope — to bully its way to further injustices". CP

Andy Worthington is a British historian and the author of *The Guantánamo Files: The Stories of the 774 Detainees in America's Illegal Prison* (to be published by Pluto Press in October 2007).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

McKinley, Bush and The Distractions of War

By Eva Liddell

By the time that William McKinley became president in 1896, followed around by his front man Mark Hanna, the guy who Karl Rove claimed to have modeled himself, the Republican Party was running out of steam. For twenty years the Party had insisted it was the "one true Party" based on one prime to glory. The Great Emancipator, the hero of the plain folk, had been a Republican too.

There had been a lot of money made during the Civil War favoring the cities of the North. War had built factories, enlarged mills, increased the railroads and telegraph services. Trades, crafts, labor unions —all bloomed into existence aided by the war tariff. It wasn't so kind to the farmer or the plain rural folk no matter where they lived, be it the North or the Midwest. Twenty years after the war, they were beginning to see the real picture of what the Civil War meant to them economically. They threw away their photograph of Lincoln rising among the clouds into the embrace of Jesus Christ. The Lincoln cult was replaced by cynicism and the realization that while the Western farmer may have fought the South to save the Union, the real gain was made by businessmen in the North.

Before 1896, during the anomalous situation of having a Democrat for a president, the people had made known to the politicians they were angry and agitated at their economic circumstances which they blamed on the monopolists. The Panics during Cleveland's administration only deepened their plight. Their cry for reform made America's overprivileged business magnates a pack of frightened men. In 1896, the Democratic Party — always terrified of reform — insisted it had changed its ways and was now the "Party of Reform". It had no choice but to put up as its candidate for the presidency the orator and populist reformer William Jennings Bryan and no choice but to make sure that he lost. They picked some sleazy Bourbon Democrat out of Arkansas to manage his campaign and instructed the loyal Bryan not to make inflammatory speeches against the rich and the privileged, the only way he could have won.

When the sweet-tempered McKinley came into power, people couldn't figure him out. This was due to the fact he never told anybody what he wanted to do. He spoke in windy, vague and self-contradictory terms. The press assailed him as weak, and he did nothing to correct the impression. No other president until George Bush Jr. has been seen as such an instrument of other people's visions and the tool of their ambitions. He projected himself as the victim of circumstances and allowed his front man Hanna to be seen as the powerful force driving his campaign and running his presidency. He seemed to be even too weak to care about the insults that he was Hanna's puppet. But it was Hanna who did all the dirty work while McKinley seemed to want very little.

This appearance was a political necessity for McKinley who knew that in order to get what he wanted — which was nothing less than the radical reconstruction of the republic — he had to appear as not wanting it. He spoke in a confused fashion to the people about his vision for a new republic, one of "national unity and cohesion". He, of course, knew what this new "unity and cohesion" meant. It would quell discontent, eliminate dissent and weaken those who still had a vision of the old republic. He knew it meant the imposing of order and discipline on the country's unruly politics and on its sprawling economy. While he set about these aims, he spoke to a baffled public about the importance of "love for the flag" and his own "feelings of mystique" about red, white, and blue bunting. The press assailed his idiotic speeches as the ramblings of a confused man.

What he wanted is not a mystery now. He wanted what all presidents have wanted subsequently. To steal the wealth of the nation and concentrate it in the hands of the few. To protect the monopolists as they ally themselves to party power, all the while remaining themselves a separate party of no label except that of money.

McKinley, the political genius, knew how he would accomplish his goals. It would be through the act of foreign war with the result that imperial America would be united into "national unity and cohesion". By "accident", of course. Only an accidental empire could be acceptable to Americans.

War would kill reform. War would quell dissent. War would take the people's minds off of their domestic troubles and direct attention to foreign affairs, to war itself. Ever since McKinley, all subsequent war presidents have gone to war for essentially the same reason. The rhetoric remains unchanged. No need to fix what always works. Before going to war with Spain, McKinley announced that "all diplomatic efforts to secure the peace had been exhausted". Responsibility for the new American Empire were due to the "march of events", to the "almighty hand of God", to the accidents of war, to popular demand, to "destiny", and to "duty".

As for the Democratic Party after McKinley's "splendid little war", it could happily put talks of reform to rest. By pretending to be anti-imperialist once imperialism was safely in place, all previous internal issues were manageable. Nor was the new imperialism lost on the Southern Democrats. The once great Party of Negro Rights and Equality that now governed the "lesser breeds" in the Philippines gave the Democrats the license to treat southern blacks just as the McKinley administration intended to treat the newly colonized dark-skinned people. Segregation laws carried out by southern Democrats in 1898 and the years thereafter were no coincidence.

George Bush and the man who is supposed to be his operator, his wirepuller, his brain —Karl Rove — merely work from the template that McKinley put into place. The reasons may vary why the U.S. will want war with this country or with that one. But there is one reason that never changes. Keeping the public focused on a current war or the imminent dangers of a new one guarantees the death of domestic reform. Every need for change is thrust into the background when our immediate task is to concentrate on solving the problems of war.

Our two vaunted political parties work in collusion united by that common goal. The third party, the one with no name, the Money Power, insures that they carry it out. CP

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Kinder, Gentler Coyote

By Debbie Nathan

Bowing to anti-immigration pressure, the Bush administration announced in August that U.S. employers now have 90 days to clear up worker social security numbers that don't match with the government's database. After that, employers who don't fire out-of-status workers will face criminal sanctions. So will employees.

According to a friend of mine in the Mexican state of San Luis Potosi whom I'll call Jose, this new policy is going to make life better for women.

The intent of the new policy is to eradicate employment opportunities in the U.S.A. for the undocumented. Of course, we're talking only about the overground economy, including the agricultural sector. Will we be getting any fresh broccoli or apples after the new rule takes effect? Whatever – there's always McDonald's.

Meanwhile, there's the black market – which is far more about female nannies and house cleaners than about crack dealer dudes. Employers of domestic help rarely pay social security, and the government certainly won't be knocking on the doors of lady bosses in the West Village or Brentwood, much less checking ID amid the fancy strollers in Washington Square Park.

Still, for Central American and Mexican women, there's the fabled, illegal trip across the evil Rio Grande or Arizona desert, with the snakes and dehydration and sexually assaultive "coyotes" – the smugglers. Who wants to risk that? Answer: Plenty of distaffers. Studies show that half of illegal immigrants coming from the south today are female. And Jose explained to me that crossing for women is getting downright convenient, thanks to the U.S. government.

Jose has crossed solo several times in the past 15 years to work in agriculture. Lately, though, stepped up border enforcement has made it so difficult to get past Laredo that he's taken to hiring a coyote for $1,300. He knows lots of people who've always used smugglers, and until recently, he says, the coyotes were a nasty lot. "They would cross 40 people at a time, impose the charges at the border, make everyone walk three to six days to San Antonio, often rob customers, and frequently rape the women travelers."

But now, Jose says, all those extra Border Patrol agents are having an effect. It's so hard to cross now that fewer people are coming. This has created intense competition among the coyotes, who have responded by vastly improving their services.

"Now, they pay your way on a first-class bus from your home town to the border. They cross only 8 people at a time. After they get you to the U.S. side, you only have to walk a few hours because they've made arrangements with farmers in South Texas to put you up for the night, even feed you. And some of those farmers are gringos," Jose adds. "Then they put you in vans and drive you to Houston."

"And they're much nicer to women now. No more robberies. No rapes. They know it will get out by word of mouth, and they desperately want to maintain and expand their customer base." CP

Debbie Nathan lived in El Paso for many years before moving to New York. She wrote *Women and Other Aliens: Essays from the U.S.-Mexico Border* (Cinco Puntos, El Paso: 1991).

CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558

Phone 1-800-840-3683 for our new T-shirts and to purchase CounterPunch's new book *How the Irish Invented Slang* by Daniel Cassidy.

1st Class
Presort
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 269
Skokie, IL

First Class

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED